

# Quenched invariance principles for random walks on percolation clusters.

P. Mathieu \*

A. Piatnitski †

February 1, 2008

## Abstract

We prove the almost sure ('quenched') invariance principle for a random walker on an infinite percolation cluster in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ .

## 1 Introduction

Consider super critical Bernoulli bond percolation in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ : for  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , we write:  $x \sim y$  if  $x$  and  $y$  are neighbors in the grid  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , and let  $\mathbb{E}_d$  be the set of non-oriented nearest pairs  $(x, y)$ . We identify a sub-graph of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  with an application  $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$ , writing  $\omega(x, y) = 1$  if the edge  $(x, y)$  is present in  $\omega$  and  $\omega(x, y) = 0$  otherwise. Thus  $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$  is the set of sub-graphs of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Edges pertaining to  $\omega$  are then called *open*. Connected components of such a sub-graph will be called *clusters* and the cluster of  $\omega$  containing a point  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  is denoted with  $\mathcal{C}_x(\omega)$ .

Define now  $Q$  to be the probability measure on  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$  under which the random variables  $(\omega(e), e \in \mathbb{E}_d)$  are Bernoulli( $p$ ) independent variables and let

$$p_c = \sup\{p; Q[\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty] = 0\}$$

be the critical probability. It is known that  $p_c \in ]0, 1[$ , see [5]. Throughout the paper, we choose a parameter  $p$  such that

$$p > p_c. \quad (1.1)$$

Then,  $Q$  almost surely, the graph  $\omega$  has a unique infinite cluster there after denoted with  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$ .

We are interested in the behaviour of the simple symmetric random walk on  $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ : let  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  be the space of càd-làg  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -valued functions on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  and  $X(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , be the coordinate maps from  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  to  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ .  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  is endowed with the Skorohod topology. For a given sub-graph  $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}_d}$ , and for  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , let  $P_x^\omega$  be the probability measure on  $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{Z}^d)$  under which the coordinate process is the Markov chain starting at  $X(0) = x$  and with generator

$$\mathcal{L}^\omega f(x) = \frac{1}{n^\omega(x)} \sum_{y \sim x} \omega(x, y)(f(y) - f(x)),$$

where  $n^\omega(x)$  is the number of neighbors of  $x$  in the cluster  $\mathcal{C}_x(\omega)$ .

The behaviour of  $X(t)$  under  $P_x^\omega$  can be described as follows: starting from point  $x$ , the random walker waits for an exponential time of parameter 1 and then chooses, uniformly at random, one of its neighbors in  $\mathcal{C}_x(\omega)$ , say  $y$  and moves to  $y$ . This procedure is then iterated with independent hoping times. The walker clearly never leaves the cluster of  $\omega$  it started from. Since edges are not oriented, the measures with weights  $n^\omega(x)$  on the possibly different clusters of  $\omega$  are reversible.

\*Université de Provence, CMI, 39 rue Joliot-Curie, 13013 Marseille, FRANCE. pierre.mathieu@cmi.univ-mrs.fr

†Lebedev Physical Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences and Narvik Institute of Technology, P. O. Box 385, N-8505 Narvik, NORWAY. andrey@sci.lebedev.ru

Let  $Q_0$  be the conditional measure  $Q_0(\cdot) = Q(\cdot | \#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty)$  and let  $Q_0.P_x^\omega$  be the so-called *annealed* semi-direct product measure law defined by

$$Q_0.P_x^\omega[F(\omega, X(\cdot))] = \int P_x^\omega[F(\omega, X(\cdot))] dQ_0(\omega).$$

Note that  $X(t)$  is not Markovian anymore under  $Q_0.P_x^\omega$ . From [3], it is known that, under  $Q_0.P_0^\omega$ , the process  $(X^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}), t \in \mathbb{R}_+)$  satisfies an invariance principle as  $\varepsilon$  tends to 0 i.e. it converges in law to the law of a non-degenerate Brownian motion. The proof is based on the *point of view of the particule*. It relies on the fact that the law of the environment  $\omega$ , viewed from the current position of the Markov chain is reversible, when considered under the annealed measure. It does not give any information on the behaviour of the walk for a typical choice of  $\omega$ . On the other hand, only partial results in dimension higher than 4 have been obtained for almost sure, also called *quenched*, invariance principles in the joint work of V. Sidoravicius and A-S. Sznitman, [13]. Our result holds for any dimension:

**Theorem 1.1**  *$Q$  almost surely on the event  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ , under  $P_0^\omega$ , the process  $(X^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon X(t/\varepsilon^2), t \in \mathbb{R}_+)$  converges in law as  $\varepsilon$  tends to 0 to a Brownian motion with covariance matrix  $\sigma^2 Id$  where  $\sigma^2$  is positive and does not depend on  $\omega$ .*

Our strategy of proof follows the classical pattern introduced by S.M. Kozlov for averaging random walks with random conductances in [10]. The method of Kozlov was successfully used under ellipticity assumptions that are clearly not satisfied here. We refer in particular to first part of [13] where random walks in elliptic environments are considered. The main idea is to modify the process  $X(t)$  by the addition of a *corrector* in such a way that the sum is a martingale under  $P_0^\omega$  and use a martingale invariance principle. Then one has to prove that, in the rescaled limit, the corrector can be neglected or equivalently that the corrector has sub-linear growth. For this second step, in a classical elliptic set-up, one would invoke the Poincaré inequality and the compact embedding of  $H^1$  into  $L^2$ . For percolation models, a weaker, but still suitable form of the Poincaré inequality was proved in the paper of P. Mathieu and E. Remy [12], see also [1]. However another difficulty arises: our reference measure is the counting measure on the cluster at the origin. When rescaled, it does converge to Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  but, for a fixed  $\varepsilon$  it is of course singular. Thus rather than using classical functional analysis tools, one has to turn to  $L^2$  techniques in varying spaces or 2 scale convergence arguments as they have been recently developped for the theory of homogenization of singular random structures in the work of A. Piatnitski and V. Jikov, see [9]. An elementary self-contained construction of the corrector is given in section 2.2. We also provide an approach to 2 scale convergence avoiding explicit reference to the results of [9]. For background material on homogenization theory in both periodic and random environments we refer to the book [8] where percolation models are considered in chapter 9.

*Note on the constants:* throughout the paper  $\beta$  and  $c$  will denote positive constants depending only on  $d$  and  $p$  whose values might change from place to place.

*Note:* N. Berger and M. Biskup recently obtained a proof of Theorem (1.1), see [2]. Although they also rely on the construction of a corrector, their method to prove the sub-linear growth of the corrector is quite different from ours.

## 2 Proof of the theorem

Let  $|x| = \max |x_i|$ . We use the notation  $x \cdot y$  for the scalar product of the two vectors  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We also use the notation  $Q_0(\cdot) = Q(\cdot | \#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty)$ .

### 2.1 Tightness

We start recalling the Gaussian upper bound obtained by M. Barlow for walks on percolation clusters, see [1]. The corresponding lower bound also holds, but we won't need it here. Note that, Barlow's bound is only used in the proof of the tightness. Remember that  $p > p_c$  so that,  $Q$ .a.s. the percolation sub-graph  $\omega$  contains a unique infinite cluster denoted with  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$ .

Statement from [1]:  $Q$ .a.s., for any  $x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$  there exists a random variable  $S_x$  such that whenever  $x$  and  $y$  belong to  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$  and  $t \geq S_x$  then

$$P_x^\omega[X(t) = y] \leq ct^{-d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|y-x|^2}{ct}\right). \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover,

$$Q[x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), S_x \geq t] \leq c \exp(-ct^{\varepsilon(d)}) \quad \text{with } \varepsilon(d) > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

((2.1) is only stated with the further restriction that  $t \geq |x-y|$  in [1]. If  $t \leq |x-y|$ , then (2.1) follows from the Carne-Varopoulos bound, see [12], appendix C.)

**Lemma 2.1**  *$Q$  almost surely on the event  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ , under  $P_0^\omega$ , the sequence of processes  $(X^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}), t \in \mathbb{R}_+)$  is tight in the Skorohod topology.*

*Proof:* it is sufficient to check that  $Q$ .a.s. on the event  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ , for any  $T > 0$  one has

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\tau} E_0^\omega[|X^\varepsilon(\tau + \delta) - X^\varepsilon(\tau)|^2] = 0,$$

where  $\tau$  is any stopping time in the filtration generated by  $X^\varepsilon$  that is bounded by  $T$ . See [4], page 138.

But, using the Markov property, we get that for large enough  $K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_0^\omega[|X^\varepsilon(\tau + \delta) - X^\varepsilon(\tau)|^2] \\ &= \varepsilon^2 E_0^\omega[|X(\frac{\tau + \delta}{\varepsilon^2}) - X(\frac{\tau}{\varepsilon^2})|^2] \\ &\leq \varepsilon^2 \sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2} E_y^\omega[|X(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2})|^2] + e^{-K/2}, \end{aligned}$$

In the 'sup', the restriction  $|y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2$  is justified since the walker makes more than  $k$  steps in time  $t$  with probability lower than  $e^{-k/t}$ . Since we are conditioning on the event  $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ , one may replace the condition  $y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$  by the condition  $y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$  in the last term of this inequality.

From (2.1), it follows that the first term is bounded by  $c\delta$  provided that  $\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2} \geq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2} S_y$ . From (2.2), we get that

$$Q\left[\sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2} S_y > \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2}\right] \leq c \frac{K}{\varepsilon^2} \exp(-c(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2})^{\varepsilon(d)}).$$

Using the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we deduce that  $Q$ .a.s. on the event  $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \mathcal{C}(\omega)$

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^2 \sup_{y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |y| \leq K/\varepsilon^2} S_y = 0,$$

and the proof is completed by letting  $K$  tend to  $\infty$ . ■

## 2.2 Construction of the corrector

**Random fields:** we recall that  $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{E}^d}$  is the set of sub-graphs of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . We shall denote with  $\mathcal{B}$  the set of neighbors of the origin in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . With some abuse of notation, we write  $\omega(b)$  instead of  $\omega(0, b)$  when  $b \in \mathcal{B}$ . We use the notation  $x.\omega$  to denote the natural action of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  on  $\Omega$  by translations.  $\Omega$  is equipped with the product sigma field.

We endow  $\Omega \times \mathcal{B}$  with the measure  $M$  defined by

$$\int u dM = Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) u(\omega, b) \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}\right].$$

Note that if two random fields  $u$  and  $v$  coincide in  $L^2(\Omega \times \mathcal{B}, M)$ , then,  $Q$ .a.s. on the event  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ ,  $u(\omega, b) = v(\omega, b)$  for any  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\omega(b) = 1$ .

Let  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .  $u$  is said to be *local* if it only depends on a finite number of coordinates. We associate to  $u$  its *gradient*:  $\nabla^{(\omega)} u : \Omega \times \mathcal{B}$  defined by

$$\nabla^{(\omega)} u(\omega, b) = u(b.\omega) - u(\omega).$$

Let  $L_{pot}^2$  be the closure in  $L^2(\Omega \times \mathcal{B}, M)$  of the set of gradients of local fields, and  $L_{sol}^2$  be its orthogonal complement in  $L^2(\Omega \times \mathcal{B}, M)$ .

Fields in  $L_{pot}^2$  satisfy a *co-cycle* relation: on the event  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ , for any  $u \in L_{pot}^2$  and any closed path in  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$  of the form  $\gamma = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k)$  with  $x_i \sim x_{i+1}$ ,  $\omega(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$  and  $x_0 = x_k = 0$  then  $\sum_{i=1}^k u(x_{i-1}, \omega, x_i - x_{i-1}) = 0$ .

Let us write down explicitly what it means for a square integrable field  $v$  to be in  $L_{sol}^2$ : let  $u$  be a local function on  $\Omega$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q\left[\left(\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) v(\omega, b) \nabla^{(\omega)} u(\omega, b) \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}\right)\right] &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(\omega, b) \nabla^{(\omega)} u(\omega, b) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] \\ &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(\omega, b) (u(b.\omega) - u(\omega)) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the translation invariance of  $Q$ , we then get that

$$\begin{aligned} Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(\omega, b) u(b.\omega) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v((-b).b.\omega, b) u(b.\omega) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(b.\omega), -b \in \mathcal{C}(b.\omega)}\right] \\ &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v((-b).\omega, b) u(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), -b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] = Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(b.\omega, -b) u(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] \\ &= Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) v(b.\omega, -b) u(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

So that

$$Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} v(\omega, b) (u(b.\omega) - u(\omega)) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega), b \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}\right] = Q\left[\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) u(\omega) (v(b.\omega, -b) - v(\omega, b)) \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}\right].$$

Thus we have proved the following integration by parts formula:

$$\int v \nabla^{(\omega)} u dM = -Q[n^\omega(0) u \nabla^{(\omega)*} v \mathbf{1}_{\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)=\infty}], \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\nabla^{(\omega)*} v(\omega) = \frac{1}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(b) (v(\omega, b) - v(b.\omega, -b)).$$

(2.3) holds for a square integrable random field  $v$  and any local function  $u$ .

As a consequence, taking  $v$  to be constant, note that  $\int \nabla^{(\omega)} u dM = 0$  for any local  $u$ . By extension, we will also have  $\int u dM = 0$  for any  $u \in L_{pot}^2$ .

A square integrable random field  $v$  is in  $L_{sol}^2$  if it satisfies  $\nabla^{(\omega)*} v = 0$   $Q$ .a.s. on the set  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ .

**Definition of the corrector:** let  $b \in \mathcal{B}$ . Define the random field  $\hat{b}(\omega, e) = \mathbf{1}_{e=b} - \mathbf{1}_{e=-b}$ . Let  $G_b$  be the unique solution in  $L_{pot}^2$  satisfying the equation

$$\hat{b} + G_b(\omega, e) \in L_{sol}^2. \quad (2.4)$$

( $G_b$  is simply the projection of  $-\hat{b}$  on  $L_{pot}^2$ .)

We define the corrector  $\chi : \Omega \times \mathcal{C}_0(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by the equation

$$\chi(\omega, x+e) \cdot b - \chi(\omega, x) \cdot b = G_b(x, \omega, e), \quad (2.5)$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $b, e \in \mathcal{B}$ . (In this equation  $\chi(\cdot) \cdot b$  stands for the usual scalar product of the two  $\mathbb{R}^d$  vectors  $\chi(\cdot)$  and  $b$ . Note that there is no ambiguity because  $G_b = -G_{-b}$  as can be directly seen from equation (2.4).) Observe that, unlike  $G_b$ , the corrector  $\chi$  is not an homogeneous field.

The solution to (2.4) being unique in  $L_{pot}^2$ , the value of  $G_b(\omega, e)$  is uniquely determined whenever  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$  and  $e \in \mathcal{B}$  satisfies  $\omega(e) = 1$ . Therefore  $G_b(x, \omega, e)$  is well defined  $Q$ .a.s. on the set  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$  for any  $x$  and  $e$  s.t.  $x$  and  $x+e$  belong to  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$ . Thus, if  $x$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ , then the value of  $\chi(\omega, x) - \chi(\omega, 0)$  can be computed integrating (2.5) along a path in  $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$  from the origin to  $x$ . That this value does not depend on the choice of the path is an immediate consequence of the co-cycle relation satisfied by  $G_b$ . We conclude that  $\chi(\omega, x)$  is uniquely determined by equation (2.5) up to an additive constant (that might depend on  $\omega$ ).

**The martingale property:** we claim that the random process  $X(t) + \chi(\omega, X(t))$  is a martingale under  $P_0^\omega$  for  $Q$  almost all  $\omega$  s.t.  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ . Note that since the process  $X(t)$ , starting from the origin, never leaves  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$ ,  $\chi(\omega, X(t))$  is indeed well defined.

We choose  $\omega$  s.t.  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ .

Since  $G_b \in L_{pot}^2$ , the co-cycle relation implies that  $G_b(\omega, e) + G_b(e, \omega, -e) = 0$  for any  $e \in \mathcal{B}$  s.t.  $\omega(e) = 1$ . Comparing the expression of  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$  with the definition of  $\nabla^{(\omega)*}$ , we then see that  $\mathcal{L}^\omega \chi(\omega, x) \cdot b = \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{(\omega)*} G_b(x, \omega)$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ .

Let  $\phi(x) = x + \chi(\omega, x)$ . Noting that  $\hat{b}(\omega, e) = e \cdot b$  and that  $\hat{b}(e, \omega, -e) = -b \cdot e$ , we see that  $\nabla^{(\omega)*} \hat{b}(\omega) = \frac{2}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(e) b \cdot e$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\omega \phi(\omega, x) \cdot b &= \frac{1}{n^\omega(x)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(x, x+e) e \cdot b + \mathcal{L}^\omega \chi(\omega, x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{(\omega)*} \hat{b}(x, \omega) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^{(\omega)*} G_b(x, \omega) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This last equality holds for any  $x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ . We have proved the martingale property.

**The invariance principle:** to each pair of neighbouring points  $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$  such that  $\omega(x, y) = 1$  attach a Poisson process of rate  $1/n^\omega(x)$ , say  $N_t^{x,y}$ , all of them independent. Let  $Y$  be the solution of the equation  $Y(0) = 0$ ,

$$dY(t) = \sum_{y \sim Y(t-)} \omega(Y(t-), y) (y - Y(t-)) dN_t^{Y(t-), y}.$$

Then the law of the random process  $(Y(t), t \geq 0)$  is  $P_0^\omega$ .

Let  $\omega$  be such that  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ . Let  $N(t) = Y(t) + \chi(\omega, Y(t))$ . From the previous paragraph, we already know that  $N$  is a martingale. Its bracket can be computed using Itô's formula. We fix a direction  $b \in \mathcal{B}$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} d \langle N \cdot b \rangle(t) &= \frac{1}{n^\omega(Y(t-))} \sum_{y \sim Y(t-)} \omega(Y(t-), Y(t-) + e) (y \cdot b + \chi(\omega, y) \cdot b - Y(t-) \cdot b - \chi(\omega, Y(t-)) \cdot b)^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^{Y(t-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} Y(t-).\omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(Y(t-).\omega, e))^2 dt.$$

Back to the process  $X$  and denoting  $M(t) = X(t) + \chi(\omega, X(t))$ , we can equivalently write that

$$d \langle M \cdot b \rangle (t) = \frac{1}{n^{X(t-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} X(t-).\omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(X(t-).\omega, e))^2 dt.$$

Let  $\tilde{Q}_0$  be the probability measure

$$\tilde{Q}_0(A) = \frac{\int_A n^\omega(0) dQ_0(\omega)}{\int n^\omega(0) dQ_0(\omega)}.$$

$X(t-).\omega$  is the process of the environment viewed from the particule. The measure  $\tilde{Q}_0$  is reversible, invariant and ergodic with respect to  $X(t-).\omega$ , see Lemma 4.9 in [3]. As a consequence, we get that,  $Q$ .a.s. on the set  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ ,

$$\frac{\langle M \cdot b \rangle (t)}{t} \rightarrow \tilde{Q}_0\left(\frac{1}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(\omega, e))^2\right).$$

Let now  $M^\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon M(t/\varepsilon^2)$ . We have proved that, for any  $t > 0$ , as  $\varepsilon$  tends to 0

$$\langle M^\varepsilon \cdot b \rangle (t) \rightarrow t \tilde{Q}_0\left(\frac{1}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(\omega, e))^2\right).$$

For any function  $f$  that vanishes on the diagonal, the process

$$\sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} f(X(s), X(s-)) - \int_0^t ds \frac{1}{n^{X(s-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} X(s-).\omega(e) f(X(s-) + e, X(s-))$$

is a martingale. Applying this to  $f(x, y) = (b \cdot (x + \chi(\omega, x)) - b \cdot (y + \chi(\omega, y)))^2 \mathbf{1}_{|b \cdot (x + \chi(\omega, x)) - b \cdot (y + \chi(\omega, y))| \geq \eta}$  for some direction  $b$  and some  $\eta > 0$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} (M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{|M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b| \geq \eta} \\ & - \int_0^t ds \frac{1}{n^{X(s-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} X(s-).\omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(X(s-).\omega, e))^2 \mathbf{1}_{|e \cdot b + G_b(X(s-).\omega, e)| \geq \eta} \end{aligned}$$

is a martingale. Taking expectations and using the ergodic theorem for the process  $X(s-).\omega$  we get that, on the set  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_0^\omega \left[ \frac{1}{t} \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} (M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{|M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b| \geq \eta} \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t ds E_0^\omega \left[ \frac{1}{n^{X(s-).\omega(0)}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} X(s-).\omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(X(s-).\omega, e))^2 \mathbf{1}_{|e \cdot b + G_b(X(s-).\omega, e)| \geq \eta} \right] \\ & \rightarrow \tilde{Q}_0\left(\frac{1}{n^\omega(0)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(e) (e \cdot b + G_b(\omega, e))^2 \mathbf{1}_{|e \cdot b + G_b(\omega, e)| \geq \eta}\right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any  $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & E_0^\omega \left[ \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} (M^\varepsilon(s) \cdot b - M^\varepsilon(s-) \cdot b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{|M^\varepsilon(s) \cdot b - M^\varepsilon(s-) \cdot b| \geq \eta} \right] \\ & = \varepsilon^2 E_0^\omega \left[ \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t/\varepsilon^2} (M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{|M(s) \cdot b - M(s-) \cdot b| \geq \eta/\varepsilon} \right] \end{aligned}$$

→ 0.

From the martingale convergence theorem, Theorem 5.1 part a in [7], we then deduce that,  $Q$ .a.s. on the set  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ , the law of the process  $\varepsilon X(\cdot/\varepsilon^2) + \varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\cdot/\varepsilon^2))$  under  $P_0^\omega$  converges to the law of a Brownian motion with a deterministic covariance matrix  $A$ .

That  $A$  is diagonal is proved in [3], Theorem 4.7, 3. One can argue that  $A$  is positive as a consequence of the Gaussian lower bounds obtained in [1], but the original proof is given in [6].

We therefore conclude that Theorem 1.1 will follow if we can prove that,  $Q$ .a.s. on the set  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ , for all  $t > 0$ ,  $\varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(t/\varepsilon^2))$  converges to 0 in  $P_0^\omega$  probability.

## 2.3 Convergence of the corrector

We now check that the contribution of the corrector is negligible in the limit i.e. we prove that, for all  $t$ ,  $\varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(t/\varepsilon^2))$  converges to 0 in  $P_0^\omega$  probability,  $Q$ .a.s. on the set  $\#\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) = \infty$ . In view of (2.1), it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\varepsilon\chi(\omega, y)|^2 = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}$$

Below, we use the Poincaré inequality to prove that there exist some constants  $a_\varepsilon(\omega)$  such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\varepsilon\chi(\omega, y) - a_\varepsilon|^2 = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.6)$$

As a consequence of (2.1), (2.6) implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_0^\omega [|\varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2})) - a_\varepsilon| \geq K] = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}, \text{ and for any } K > 0.$$

But the invariance principle for the process  $\varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}) + \varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}))$  implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_0^\omega [|\varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}) + \varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}))| \geq K] = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}, \text{ and for any } K > 0,$$

and (2.1) implies that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_0^\omega [|\varepsilon X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2})| \geq K] = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}, \text{ and for any } K > 0.$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_0^\omega [|\varepsilon\chi(\omega, X(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}))| \geq K] = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}, \text{ and for any } K > 0.$$

Thus we see that  $a_\varepsilon$  tends to 0 and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^d \sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} |\varepsilon\chi(\omega, y)|^2 = 0 \quad Q_0\text{-a.s.}$$

It remains to justify (2.6).

**Poincaré inequalities:** since  $G_b$  is square integrable, the spatial ergodic theorem, see [11] page 205, implies that  $\varepsilon^d \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \omega(e) (G_b(x.\omega, e))^2$  has a  $Q$ .a.s. finite limit. Therefore

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^d \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |x| \leq 1/(1-a)\varepsilon} x.\omega(e) (G_b(x.\omega, e))^2 < \infty, \quad (2.7)$$

$Q_0$ .a.s. and for any constant  $0 < a < 1$ .

We quote from [12], Theorem 1.3: for some  $\varepsilon > 0$  define  $\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon$  to be the connected component of the intersection of  $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$  with the box  $[-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}]^d$  that contains the origin. There exists a constant  $\beta$  such that  $Q_0$ .a.s. for small enough  $\varepsilon$ , for any function  $u : \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  one has

$$\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \leq \beta \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{x \sim y \in \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon} \omega(x,y) (u(x) - u(y))^2.$$

Since  $\#\mathcal{C}^\varepsilon$  is of order  $\varepsilon^{-d}$  for small enough  $\varepsilon$  and since  $\mathcal{C}_0(\omega) \cap [-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}]^d \subset \mathcal{C}^{(1-a)\varepsilon}$  for some constant  $a$ , we therefore have a constant  $\beta$  such that,  $Q_0$ .a.s. for small enough  $\varepsilon$ , for any function  $u : \mathcal{C}(\omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\varepsilon^d \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x|, |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \leq \beta \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{x \sim y \in \mathcal{C}^{(1-a)\varepsilon}} \omega(x,y) (u(x) - u(y))^2.$$

We use this last inequality for the function  $u(x) = \chi(\omega, x)$  to get that,

$$\varepsilon^d \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x|, |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\chi(\omega, x) - \chi(\omega, y))^2 \leq \beta \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega); |x| \leq 1/(1-a)\varepsilon} x \cdot \omega(e) (G_b(x, \omega, e))^2.$$

By (2.7) we therefore get that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{2d} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x|, |y| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\varepsilon \chi(\omega, x) - \varepsilon \chi(\omega, y))^2 < \infty,$$

$Q_0$ .a.s., and thus

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\varepsilon \chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon)^2 < \infty, \quad (2.8)$$

$Q_0$ .a.s. where  $a_\varepsilon$  is the mean value of  $\varepsilon \chi(\omega, x)$  on the set  $\{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon\}$ .

**Two scale convergence:** we first introduce some notation. Let  $G = ]-1, 1[^d$ . For  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we define the measures

$$\mu_\omega = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} n^\omega(z) \delta_z, \quad \mu_\omega^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^d \sum_{z \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} n^\omega(z) \delta_{\varepsilon z}.$$

Given a direction  $e \in \mathcal{B}$ , the gradient of a function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is

$$\nabla_e^\varepsilon \phi(z) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\phi(z + \varepsilon e) - \phi(z)).$$

Let us now choose  $b_0 \in \mathcal{B}$  and let

$$\psi^\varepsilon(\omega, z) = (\varepsilon \chi(\omega, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} z) - a_\varepsilon) \cdot b_0.$$

Thus  $\psi^\varepsilon$  is well defined for  $z \in \varepsilon \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ . From the definition of  $\chi$ , we have

$$\nabla_e^\varepsilon \psi^\varepsilon(\omega, z) = G_{b_0}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega, e),$$

for  $z \in \varepsilon \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ .

*Keep in mind that for  $z' \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , the expression  $z' \cdot \omega$  denotes the graph obtained by translating  $\omega$  by  $z'$ . In particular, for  $z \in \varepsilon \mathbb{Z}^d$ , then  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega(e)$  is either 0 or 1, depending on whether the edge  $(z, z + e)$  belongs to  $\omega$  or not. We sometimes prefer the notation  $(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \omega(e)$  in order to avoid possible confusion.*

In our new notation, (2.7) and (2.8) now read:

$$C_1(\omega) = \sup_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{\varepsilon} \int_G (\frac{z}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \omega(e) (\nabla_e^\varepsilon \psi^\varepsilon(\omega, z))^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) < \infty, \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$C_2(\omega) = \sup_{\varepsilon} \int_G (\psi^\varepsilon(\omega, z))^2 d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) < \infty, \quad (2.10)$$

for  $Q_0$  almost any  $\omega$ . For further reference, let us call  $\Omega_1$  the set of  $\omega$ 's such that  $0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ ,  $C_1(\omega) < \infty$  and  $C_2(\omega) < \infty$  and observe that  $Q_0(\Omega_1) = 1$ .

Define the measure

$$\mathcal{P}(A) = Q[\mathbf{1}_A(\omega) n^\omega(0) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)}].$$

According to the ergodic theorem, for any smooth function  $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$  and any  $u \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{P})$  we have

$$\int_G \phi(z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega\right) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow \left(\int_G \phi(z) dz\right) \left(\int_\Omega u(\omega') d\mathcal{P}(\omega')\right), \quad (2.11)$$

$Q_0$ -a.s.

We endow  $\Omega$  with its natural (product) topology to turn it into a compact space. We will use the notation  $C(\Omega)$  for continuous real valued functions defined on  $\Omega$ . Using standart separability arguments, we see that (2.11) holds simultaneously for any  $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$  and  $u \in C(\Omega)$  on a set of full  $Q_0$  measure. More precisely, let  $\Omega_2$  be the set of  $\omega$ 's such that  $0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$  and, for any functions  $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$  and  $u \in C(\Omega)$  one has:

$$\int_G \phi(z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega\right) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow \left(\int_G \phi(z) dz\right) \left(\int_\Omega u(\omega') d\mathcal{P}(\omega')\right), \quad (2.12)$$

and, for any  $e \in \mathcal{B}$ ,

$$\int_G \phi(z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega\right) G_{b_0}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \omega, e\right) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow \left(\int_G \phi(z) dz\right) \left(\int_\Omega u(\omega') G_{b_0}(\omega', e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega')\right). \quad (2.13)$$

Then  $Q_0(\Omega_2) = 1$ . Finally let  $\Omega_0 = \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ .

In the sequel  $\alpha$  will denote an element of  $\Omega_0$ . Consider the family of linear functionals

$$L^{\varepsilon, \alpha}(u, \phi) = \int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z).$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get that

$$(L^{\varepsilon, \alpha}(u, \phi))^2 \leq \int_G (\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z))^2 d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \int_G \phi(z)^2 u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha\right)^2 d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z).$$

From (2.10) and (2.12) we deduce that for  $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$  and  $u \in C(\Omega)$

$$\limsup_\varepsilon (L^{\varepsilon, \alpha}(u, \phi))^2 \leq C_2(\alpha) \int_G \phi(z)^2 dz \int_\Omega u(\omega)^2 d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

Therefore, up to extracting a sub-sequence, we can assume that for any smooth  $\phi$  and any continuous  $u \in C(\Omega)$ ,  $L^{\varepsilon, \alpha}(u, \phi)$  has a limit say  $L^\alpha(u, \phi)$  where  $L^\alpha$  is a linear functional satisfying

$$(L^\alpha(u, \phi))^2 \leq C_2(\alpha) \int_G \phi(z)^2 dz \int_\Omega u(\omega)^2 d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

Thus  $L^\alpha$  can be extended as a continuous linear functional on  $L^2(\Omega \times G, d\mathcal{P} \times dx)$  and, by Riesz's theorem, there exists a function  $v^\alpha \in L^2(\Omega \times G, d\mathcal{P} \times dx)$  such that

$$L^\alpha(u, \phi) = \int_G \phi(z) dz \int_\Omega u(\omega) v^\alpha(\omega, z) d\mathcal{P}(\omega).$$

Let us summarize the preceeding discussion: we have proved that, up to extracting a sub-sequence, for  $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$  and  $u \in C(\Omega)$ ,

$$\int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow \int_G \phi(z) dz \int_\Omega u(\omega) v^\alpha(\omega, z) d\mathcal{P}(\omega). \quad (2.14)$$

We will prove the following

**Lemma 2.2** For any  $\alpha \in \Omega_0$ ,  $v^\alpha(\omega, z) = 0$  for Lebesgue almost any  $z \in G$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  almost any  $\omega$ .

As a consequence of this Lemma, we have that for  $Q_0$  almost any  $\alpha$ , for any function  $\phi \in C^\infty(G)$ ,

$$\int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since we also have uniform bounds on the  $L^2$  norm of  $\psi^\varepsilon$ , see (2.10), we deduce that, for any rectangle  $A \subset G$ ,

$$\int_A \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \rightarrow 0.$$

We conclude that, for any rectangle  $A \subset [-1, 1]^d$ ,  $Q_0$ .a.s.

$$\varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); \varepsilon x \in A} (\varepsilon \chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.15)$$

**Remark 2.3** The content of this part of the paper, including the proof of the Lemma in the next section, should be compared with the results of [9]. The convergence in (2.14) is known as 'two-scale convergence'. The only difference between our setting and [9] is the discrete nature of the grid whereas continuous diffusions are considered in [9].

It is also possible to directly apply the results of [9] to justify Lemma (2.2). We refer the interested reader to the first version of the present paper on the Arxiv for details. Here, we preferred to give a more self-contained approach but most of the arguments are mere copies of the proofs in [9] with some minor simplifications due to the fact that, for instance, the Palm measure  $\mathcal{P}$  is explicit and absolutely continuous w.r.t.  $Q$ .

**Proof of Lemma (2.2):** the proof is in three steps. Throughout the following proof,  $\phi$  is always assumed to be in  $C_o^\infty(G)$ , the space of smooth functions with compact support in  $G$ .

**Step 1:** we check the integration by parts formula:

$$\int_G \phi(z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = -\varepsilon \int_G \frac{1}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha, e\right) \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) \nabla_e^\varepsilon \phi(z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z), \quad (2.16)$$

where  $u$  is any function defined on  $\Omega \times \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon$  is small enough (depending on the support of  $\phi$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G \phi(z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) &= \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha)} \phi(\varepsilon x) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(x, \alpha) n^\alpha(x) \\ &= \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha)} \phi(\varepsilon x) \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} x \cdot \alpha(e) (u(x, \alpha, e) - u(x, e, \omega, -e)) n^\alpha(x). \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha)} \phi(\varepsilon x) \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} x \cdot \alpha(e) u(x, e, \alpha, -e) n^\alpha(x) = \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha)} \sum_{e' \in \mathcal{B}} x' \cdot \alpha(e') u(x', \alpha, e') \phi(\varepsilon x' + \varepsilon e') n^\alpha(x'),$$

with the change of variables  $x' = x + e$  and  $e' = -e$ . Putting the last two equalities together, one gets (2.16). Observe that boundary terms vanish because  $\phi$  has compact support and  $\varepsilon$  is small enough.

**Step 2:** we prove that  $v^\alpha(\omega, z)$  does not depend on  $\omega$  i.e. that  $Q_0$ .a.s.

$$v^\alpha(\omega, z) = \frac{\int v^\alpha(\omega', z) d\mathcal{P}(\omega')}{\int d\mathcal{P}(\omega')} = v^\alpha(z). \quad (2.17)$$

Indeed, let  $u$  be continuous on  $\Omega \times \mathcal{B}$  and  $\phi \in C_o^\infty(G)$  and use (2.14) and the integration by parts formula (2.16) to get that

$$\int_G \phi(z) dz \int_\Omega v^\alpha(\omega, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha\right) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon} -\varepsilon \int_G \frac{1}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha, e\right) \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) \nabla_e^\varepsilon(\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot) \phi)(z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $u$  is continuous, it is bounded. Note that  $(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \alpha(e) \leq n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)$ . Besides,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon} \int_G \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) (\nabla_e^\varepsilon(\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot) \phi)(z))^2 d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \leq C_1(\alpha) \|\phi\|_\infty + C_2(\alpha) \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty < \infty.$$

We conclude that, as  $\varepsilon$  tends to 0, the expression

$$\int_G \frac{1}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha, e\right) \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) \nabla_e^\varepsilon(\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot) \phi)(z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z)$$

remains bounded and therefore

$$\lim_{\varepsilon} -\varepsilon \int_G \frac{1}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} u\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z, \alpha, e\right) \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}\right) \cdot \alpha(e) \nabla_e^\varepsilon(\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot) \phi)(z) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = 0$$

and

$$\int_G \phi(z) dz \int_\Omega v^\alpha(\omega, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = 0.$$

By (2.3) we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega v^\alpha(\omega, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\omega) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_\Omega v^\alpha(\omega, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\omega) n^\omega(0) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} dQ(\omega) \\
&= - \int u \nabla^{(\omega)} v^\alpha(\cdot, z) dM.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have proved that

$$\int_G \phi(z) dz \int u \nabla^{(\omega)} v^\alpha(\cdot, z) dM = 0,$$

for any  $\phi \in C_o^\infty(G)$  and continuous  $u$ . We deduce that  $Q_0$ -a.s., for any  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\omega(b) = 1$  and for Lebesgue almost any  $z$ , then  $v^\alpha(b, \omega, z) = v^\alpha(\omega, z)$ . Integrating this equality on a path between 0 and  $x \in \mathcal{C}_0(\omega)$ , we then get that  $Q_0$ -a.s. for any  $x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)$  and for Lebesgue almost any  $z$ , then  $v^\alpha(\omega, z) = v^\alpha(x, \omega, z)$ . Therefore, since  $\mu_\omega^\varepsilon$  only charges  $\mathcal{C}(\omega)$ , the ergodic theorem yields:

$$v^\alpha(\omega, z) = \frac{\int_G v^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z', \omega, z) d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z')}{\int_G d\mu_\omega^\varepsilon(z')} \rightarrow \frac{\int v^\alpha(\omega', z) d\mathcal{P}(\omega')}{\int d\mathcal{P}(\omega')} = v^\alpha(z),$$

$Q_0$ -a.s in  $\omega$  and for Lebesgue almost any  $z \in G$ .

**Step 3:** we now prove that  $v^\alpha(z)$  does not depend on  $z$ . To this end, we first prove that for any smooth  $\phi \in C_o^\infty(G)$  and any continuous  $u \in L_{sol}^2$  we have

$$\sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \left( \int_G dz v^\alpha(z) \nabla \phi(z) \cdot e \right) \left( \int_\Omega \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \right) = 0, \quad (2.18)$$

where  $\tilde{u}(\omega, e) = \frac{\omega(e)}{n^\omega(0)} u(\omega, e)$ .

We have:

$$\left( \int_G dz v^\alpha(z) \nabla \phi(z) \cdot e \right) \left( \int_\Omega \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G (\nabla \phi(z) \cdot e) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \nabla_e^\varepsilon \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\phi \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) - \lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \phi(z) \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.14) in the first equality and the regularity of  $\phi$  for the second and third equalities. Using integration by parts and the definition of  $\tilde{u}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \int_G \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\phi \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \\
&= \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \int_G \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\phi \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \frac{(\frac{z}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \alpha(e)}{n^\alpha(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z)} u(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) \\
&= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_G \phi(z) \psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, z) \nabla^{(\omega)*} u(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since  $u \in L_{sol}^2$  and therefore  $\nabla^{(\omega)*} u = 0$ .

We now turn to the second term. Keep in mind that  $\nabla_e^\varepsilon (\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) = G_{b_0}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e)$ . Thus, as an application of (2.13),

$$\lim_{\varepsilon} \int_G \phi(z) \nabla_e^\varepsilon (\psi^\varepsilon(\alpha, \cdot))(z) \tilde{u}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} z \cdot \alpha, e) d\mu_\alpha^\varepsilon(z) = \left( \int_G \phi(z) dz \right) \left( \int_\Omega G_{b_0}(\omega, e) \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \right).$$

Replacing  $\tilde{u}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  by their definition, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \int_\Omega G_{b_0}(\omega, e) \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \int_\Omega G_{b_0}(\omega, e) \omega(e) u(\omega, e) \mathbf{1}_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} dQ(\omega) \\
&= \int G_{b_0} u dM = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since  $G_{b_0} \in L_{pot}^2$  and  $u \in L_{sol}^2$ . We conclude that (2.18) holds.

(2.18) was proved for any continuous  $u \in L_{sol}^2$ . By density it also holds for any  $u \in L_{sol}^2$ .

It remains to check the following fact: for any direction  $e \in \mathcal{B}$ , there exists  $u \in L_{sol}^2$  such that  $\int_\Omega \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) \neq 0$ . Indeed, first note that

$$\int_\Omega \tilde{u}(\omega, e) d\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \int_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} \omega(e) u(\omega, e) dQ(\omega).$$

Define the random field  $\tilde{e}$  by  $\tilde{e}(\omega, b) = \mathbf{1}_{b=e}$ . ( $e$  is kept fixed.) Let  $G$  be the orthogonal projection of  $-\tilde{e}$  on  $L_{pot}^2$  and let  $u = G + \tilde{e} \in L_{sol}^2$ . We write that  $u$  and  $u - \tilde{e} = G$  are orthogonal:

$$\int_{0 \in \mathcal{C}(\omega)} \omega(e) u(\omega, e) dQ(\omega) = \int u \tilde{e} dM = \int u^2 dM \neq 0,$$

because  $\tilde{u} \notin L_{sol}^2$ .

Thus we can deduce from (2.18) that  $\int_G dz v^\alpha(z) \nabla \phi(z) \cdot e = 0$  for any smooth  $\phi$  and any direction  $e$ . Therefore  $v^\alpha$  is Lebesgue almost surely constant.

**Conclusion of the proof of Lemma (2.2):** since  $\psi^\varepsilon$  has vanishing mean on  $G$  - Remember this is the way we chose  $a_\varepsilon$  - then  $v^\alpha$  also has vanishing mean in  $G$ . And since, by steps 2 and 3,  $v^\alpha$  is almost surely constant, we must have that  $Q_0$ -a.s. and for Lebesgue almost any  $z$ ,  $v^\alpha(\omega, z) = 0$ . ■

### Scaling and strong $L^2$ convergence of $\chi$ :

To conclude the proof of the Theorem, we still have to prove the strong  $L^2$  convergence in (2.6). It will be a consequence of the weak convergence (2.15) and of a scaling argument.

We choose a parameter  $\delta > 0$ . We chop the box  $[-1, 1]^d$  into smaller boxes of side length of order  $\delta$ : for  $z \in \delta \mathbb{Z}^d$  s.t.  $|z| \leq 1$ , let  $B_z$  (resp.  $C_z$ ) be the box of center  $z$  and side length  $M\delta$  (resp. side length  $\delta$ ).

$M$  is a constant whose value will be chosen later. For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we use the notation  $B_z(\varepsilon) = (\frac{1}{\varepsilon}B_z) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $C_z(\varepsilon) = (\frac{1}{\varepsilon}C_z) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

The following version of the Poincaré inequality is proved in [1], see Definition 1.7, Theorem 2.18, Lemma 2.13 and Proposition 2.17: there exist constants  $M > 1$  and  $\beta$  such that  $Q_0$ .a.s. for any  $\delta > 0$ , for small enough  $\varepsilon$ , for any  $z \in \delta\mathbb{Z}^d$  s.t.  $|z| \leq 1$  and for any function  $u : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  one has

$$\frac{1}{\#C_z(\varepsilon)} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (u(x) - u(y))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{x \sim y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap B_z(\varepsilon)} \omega(x,y) (u(x) - u(y))^2.$$

We use this inequality for the function  $\varepsilon\chi$ , to get that

$$\frac{1}{\#C_z(\varepsilon)} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - \varepsilon\chi(\omega, y))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap B_z(\varepsilon)} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(x,y) (G_b(\omega, e))^2.$$

Denoting with  $a_\varepsilon(z)$  the mean value of  $\varepsilon\chi(\omega, \cdot)$  on the set  $\mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)$ , we get that for all  $z$ ,

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon(z))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap B_z(\varepsilon)} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(x,y) (G_b(\omega, e))^2,$$

and summing over all values of  $z$ ,

$$\sum_z \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon(z))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{B}} \omega(x,y) (G_b(\omega, e))^2.$$

(Remember that the value of  $\beta$  is allowed to change from line to line.) Multiplying by  $\varepsilon^d$  and applying the spatial ergodic theorem as before, we get that

$$\limsup_\varepsilon \sum_z \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon(z))^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \int (G_b)^2 dM.$$

On the other hand, it follows from (2.15) that, for any  $z$ ,  $a_\varepsilon(z) - a_\varepsilon$  converges to 0. Therefore we must also have

$$\limsup_\varepsilon \varepsilon^d \sum_z \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega) \cap C_z(\varepsilon)} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon)^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \int (G_b)^2 dM,$$

and

$$\limsup_\varepsilon \varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon)^2 \leq \beta \delta^2 \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \int (G_b)^2 dM,$$

and, since this holds for any  $\delta > 0$ , we deduce that

$$\varepsilon^d \sum_{x \in \mathcal{C}(\omega); |x| \leq 1/\varepsilon} (\varepsilon\chi(\omega, x) - a_\varepsilon)^2 \rightarrow 0,$$

$Q_0$ .a.s. ■

## References

- [1] Barlow, M.T. (2004)  
Random walks on supercritical percolation clusters  
*Ann. Probab.* **32**, 3024-3084.
- [2] Berger, N., Biskup, M. (2005)  
Quenched invariance principle for simple random walk on percolation clusters. Preprint.  
<http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/math.PR/0503576>.
- [3] De Masi, A., Ferrari, P., Goldstein, S., Wick, W.D. (1989)  
An invariance principle for reversible Markov processes. Applications to random motions in random environments  
*Journ. Stat. Phys.* **55** (3/4), 787-855.
- [4] Ethier, S.N., Kurtz, T.G. (1986)  
*Markov processes*  
John Wiley, New York.
- [5] Grimmett, G. (1999)  
*Percolation*  
Springer-Verlag, Berlin (Second edition).
- [6] Grimmett, G., Marstrand, J. (1990)  
The supercritical phase of percolation is well behaved  
*Proc. Royal Society (London) Ser. A.* **4306**, 429-457.
- [7] Helland, I (1982)  
Central limit theorems for martingales with discrete or continuous time  
*Scand. Journ. Stat.* **9**, 79-94.
- [8] Jikov, V.V., Kozlov, S.M., Oleinik, O.A. (1994)  
Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals.  
Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [9] Jikov, V.V., Piatnitski, A.L. (2005)  
Homogenization of random singular structures and measures.  
Preprint (in Russian).
- [10] Kozlov, S.M. (1985)  
The method of averaging and walks in inhomogeneous environments  
*Russian Math. Surveys* **40** (2), 73-145.
- [11] Krengel, U (1985)  
*Ergodic theorems*  
Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- [12] Mathieu, P., Remy, E. (2004)  
Isoperimetry and heat kernel decay on percolations clusters  
*Ann. Probab.* **32**, 100-128.
- [13] Sidoravicius, V., Sznitman, A-S. (2004)  
Quenched invariance principles for walks on clusters of percolation or among random conductances  
*Prob. Th. Rel. Fields* **129**, 219-244.